

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,945	02/27/2004	Paul Dabrowa	MHAWK9	5790
6980	7590 12/28/2004		EXAMINER	
TROUTMAN	N SANDERS LLP		KAUFFMAN, BRIAN K	
	MERICA PLAZA, SUIT REE STREET , NE	TE 5200	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	A 30308-2216	·	3765	

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/789,945	DABROWA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Brian K Kauffman	3765			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address			
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		timely filed lays will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 A	August 2004.	•			
	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>4-39</u> is/are pending in the application	1.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19 and 21-39</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) 20 is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 August 2004</u> is/are:		d to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	=	• •			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1190	(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		(4) (1)			
1. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documen		ation No.			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price					
application from the International Burea	•				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , ,	ved.			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summa				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail	Date			
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 3765

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

New corrected drawings are required in this application because the drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.84. Figures 1A-3 contain shading. Shading is not permitted. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 4-12, 15-19, 21-34, and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Card et al. (5,058,518).

In regard to claims 4-8, Card et al. discloses a method of validating a pattern for a tufting machine, the method comprising: providing a pattern; providing operational characteristics of a tufting machine; and determining whether the pattern may be implemented on the tufting machine, based on the operational characteristics (col. 8, lines 63-68 and col. 9, lines 1-9).

In regard to claims 9-12 and 15-17, Card et al. discloses a method of designating how to load a tufting machine to implement a pattern, the method comprising: generating a color palette report including a percentage of each color used in a pattern; and generating a loading report indicating at least one color corresponding to at least one needle of a tufting machine, wherein the loading report provides loading instructions of the tufting machine (col. 8, lines 63-68 and col. 9, lines 1-9).

In regard to claims 18-19 and 21-25, Card et al. discloses a system for validating a pattern for a tufting machine, the system comprising: a pattern storage unit adapted to store a pattern; a machine data storage unit adapted to store operational characteristics of a tufting machine; a control unit adapted to receive the pattern from the pattern storage unit, receive operational characteristics of the tufting machine from the machine data storage unit, and determine whether the pattern may be implemented on the tufting machine based on the operational characteristics (col. 7, lines 8-12, col. 8, lines 1-43).

In regard to claims 26-30, Card et al. discloses a computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions for validating a pattern for a tufting machine, the computer-executable instructions comprising: providing a pattern; providing operational characteristics of the tufting machine; and determining whether the pattern may be implemented on the tufting machine, based on the operational characteristics (col. 8, lines 63-68 and col. 9, lines 1-9).

In regard to claims 31-34 and 37-39, Card et al. discloses a computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions for designating how to load a tufting machine to implement a pattern, the computer-executable instructions

Art Unit: 3765

comprising: generating a color palette report including a percentage of each color used in a pattern; and generating a loading report indicating at least one color corresponding to at least one needle of a tufting machine, wherein the loading report provides loading instructions of the tufting machine (col. 8, lines 63-68 and col. 9, lines 1-9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 14 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Card et al. (5,058,518) in view of Eberwein et al. (3,875,883). Card et al. does not disclose determining at least one set of yarn cones that correspond to at least one needle of the tufting machine. Eberwein et al. does disclose determining at least one set of yarn cones that correspond to at least one needle of the tufting machine (col. 4, lines 49-54). Matching the corresponding yarn cones to each needle aids in the setup of the tufting machine. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art

Page 5

at the time the invention was made to modify Card et al.'s method and computer medium to include determining at least one set of yarn cones that correspond to at least one needle of the tufting machine as taught by Eberwein et al. in order to aid the set up of the tufting machine.

Claims 13 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Card et al. (5,058,518). Card et al. does not specifically disclose determining the number of yarn cones necessary to implement a pattern on the tufting machine. However, determining the number of cones used in a pattern is a widely used practice in the industry that allows for efficient use of materials. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine the number of cones necessary to implement a pattern on the tufting machine because it is a practice that is widely used in the industry, and it allows for an efficient use of materials.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 20 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: claim 20 specifically requires that the control unit determines whether the number of colors is greater than a predetermined number of colors associated with at least one needle to the tufting machine.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K Kauffman whose telephone number is (571)272-4988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F every week.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Calvert can be reached on (571)272-4983. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BKK

JOHN DCALVERT SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700